

against these cuts. HASC Chairman McKEON, Ms. HARTZLER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RIGELL and Mr. SCHILLING should all be recognized for their commitment to our men and women in uniform.

We cannot in good conscience stand by while this body takes an ax to the defense budget.

My amendment restores cuts to the Department of Defense to the level authorized by Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act of 2011. The C.R. contains approximately \$516 billion in defense appropriations found in Division A, about \$14 billion below the defense appropriations authorized in the 2011 NDAA. We should honor that budget authorization with this amendment.

We have watched the Obama Administration develop a pattern of raiding the defense accounts first, not last, as it should be. We have a Constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense and yet, the Administration sees defense as an account that can be gutted at the expense of our national security. The government has already asked the Pentagon to find \$100 billion in efficiencies and to cut \$78 billion over the next five years. The cuts proposed in H.R. 1 are just the beginning of a downward spiral.

Our government has a constitutional mandate to protect the American people. America must retain her qualitative edge in the world. Weakness will invite aggression and lead to instability throughout the world.

As I have said before, I wholeheartedly support finding cost savings through efficiencies in all areas of the Federal Government. In the area of national defense, I believe we must reinvest those savings in other defense priorities such as an effective and robust homeland missile defense system, equipment that increases protection and combat effectiveness for our servicemembers, and modernizing our aging defense infrastructure. As vital as it is to cut our national budget so we can live within our means, my hope and desire is that we do so in a way that does not sacrifice our military capability.

Again, I thank my colleagues who have vocally supported this amendment and I ask other Members in the House to do the same.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. PAYNE. I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would prohibit any United States assistance to a country that opposed the position of the United States in the United Nations. If passed tomorrow, this amendment would prohibit assistance to over 130 countries including Cote d'Ivoire, Rwan-

da, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, and Jordan. (It prohibits assistance to countries whose recorded votes at the UN were the same as the United States less than 50 percent of the time.

This amendment does not take into account the voting realities of the UN. It only focuses on recorded votes or non-consensus issues. But the fact is, similar to the workings our own Senate, a significant amount of votes—or consensus resolutions—are adopted by the UN. According to the State Department's Voting Practices in the United Nations, when consensus resolutions are factored in as votes identical to those of the United States, average overall General Assembly voting coincidence of all UN members with the United States in 2009 was 84.3%. So, in reality, most member states are agreeing with the position of the United States.

Finally, if the logic of this bill was utilized in our own Congress, how could we ever reach bipartisan agreement? Because a Member does not support your bill, would that mean you would never work with them on anything again? Or, if the Texas delegation to the House voted against a transportation appropriation, should they receive no money to build roads?

I urge my colleagues to vote NO on this amendment.

VOTING PRACTICES IN THE UNITED NATIONS 2009

(Report to Congress submitted pursuant to Public Laws 101-246 and 108-447, Mar. 31, 2010.)

I: INTRODUCTION

This publication is the 27th annual Report to the Congress on Voting Practices at the United Nations. It is submitted in accordance with Section 406 of Public Law 101-246. This law provides, in relevant part:

"The Secretary of State shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a full and complete annual report which assesses for the preceding calendar year, with respect to each foreign country member of the United Nations, the voting practices of the governments of such countries at the United Nations, and which evaluates General Assembly and Security Council actions and the responsiveness of those governments to United States policy on issues of special importance to the United States."

This report reviews voting practices in the UN Security Council and General Assembly (UNGA) in calendar year 2009 and presents data in a variety of formats. All Security Council resolutions for the entire year are described, and voting on them is tabulated (Section II). The report also statistically measures the overall voting of UN member states at the 64th General Assembly in the autumn of 2009 in comparison with the U.S. voting record (Section III). It also lists and describes UNGA resolutions selected as particularly important to U.S. interests, again with tables for regional and political groupings (Section IV). It then presents all data by country (Section V). Finally, an annex is included to present the voting patterns on General Assembly resolutions relating to Israel and opposed by the United States.

The Security Council and the General Assembly deal with a full spectrum of issues—including threats to peace and security, disarmament, economic and social development, humanitarian relief, and human rights—that are considered critical to U.S. interests. A country's behavior at the United Nations is always relevant to its bilateral re-

lationship. Nevertheless, a country's voting record in the United Nations is only one dimension of its relations with the United States. Bilateral economic, strategic, and political issues are at times more directly important to U.S. interests.

VOTING COINCIDENCE WITH THE UNITED STATES

On non-consensus issues, i.e., those on which a vote was taken, the average overall General Assembly voting coincidence of all UN members with the United States in 2009 was 39 percent, up significantly from 2008, when it was 25.6 percent, and more than twice the figure from 2007 (18.3 percent).

When consensus resolutions are factored in as votes identical to those of the United States, a much higher measure of agreement with U.S. positions is reached—84.3 percent in 2009. (See Section III—General Assembly—Overall Votes for additional comparisons.)

FORMAT AND METHODOLOGY

The format and presentation of this report are consistent with provisions of Public Law 101-246 as amended by Public Law 108-447, and the methodology employed is the same as that used since the report's inception.

The tables in this report provide a measurement of the voting coincidence of UN member countries with the United States. However, readers are cautioned about interpreting voting coincidence percentages. In Section III (General Assembly Overall Votes), Section IV (General Assembly Important Votes and Consensus Actions), and the Annex, the percentages in the last column of the tables, under "votes only," are calculated using only votes on which both the United States and the other country in question voted Yes or No; not included are those instances when either state abstained or was absent. Abstentions and absences are often difficult to interpret, but they make a mathematical difference, sometimes significant, in the percentage results. The inclusion of the number of abstentions and absences in the tables of this report enables the reader to consider them in calculating voting coincidence percentages.

The percentages in the second-to-last column of the tables, under "including consensus," offer another perspective on General Assembly activity. These figures, by presenting the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including consensus resolutions as additional identical votes, more accurately reflect the extent of cooperation and agreement in the General Assembly. Since not all states are equally active at the United Nations, the report credits to each country a portion of the 184 consensus resolutions based on its participation in the 84 recorded Plenary votes. Each country's participation rate was calculated by dividing the number of Yes/No/Abstain votes it cast in the Plenary (i.e., the number of times it was not absent) by the total number of Plenary votes. However, this calculation assumes, for want of an attendance record, that all countries were present or absent for consensus resolutions in the same ratio as for recorded votes.

Questions about this report may be directed to the Bureau of International Organization Affairs in the Department of State.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under